

**REMARKS**

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner states:

The amendment to claim 1 deleting the step of “displaying” causes the claim to be non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. A process must have a practical application and (1) be tied to a particular machine or (2) transform a particular article to a different state. In re Comiskey, 499 F.3d 1365, 1376-77 (Fed. Cir. 2007); In re Bilski, \_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_ (Fed. Cir. 2008). Here a human could perform the steps of the method, thus it is not tied to a “particular” machine. Performing a read/write is not a transformation.

Advisory Action, Continuation Sheet. This is incorrect. Even with the “displaying” step deleted, claim 1 calls for, among other things, “a data object stored in a first storage location in a computer system.” For at least this reason, the method of claim 1 is “tied to a particular machine,” as required by *Bilski*. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner’s allegation, a human alone could not perform the method of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is directed to statutory subject matter and satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Next, the Examiner argues:

In order for Lenz’s method to address the part of the lock file containing the control field for record 007, it must determine whether “007” is in the lock file. Thus, Lenz also teaches conditioning access authorization on the control field record being contained in lock file 3-1.

Advisory Action, Continuation Sheet. This is incorrect. Nothing in *Lenz* discloses determining whether 007 is in the lock file. Indeed, the Examiner failed to point to any portion of *Lenz* that discloses determining whether 007 is in the lock file. Instead, the Examiner points to a portion of *Lenz* that states “the part of the lock file containing the control field record 007 is addressed,” and then alleges that *Lenz* must determine whether 007 is in the lock file. However, merely addressing record 007 cannot

constitute determining whether record 007 is contained in lock file 3-1. As Applicants have previously argued in previous responses, *Lenz* fails to disclose or suggest the possibility of record 007 not being contained in lock file 3-1, and thus *Lenz* fails to teach or suggest determining whether record 007 is contained in lock file 3-1.

Moreover, *Lenz* discloses conditioning access authorization based on the value of a status identification code (SKC). *Lenz*, col. 5, ll. 49-53. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, *Lenz* does not disclose conditioning access authorization based on whether record 007 is or is not contained in lock file 3-1.

In addition, *Lakhamraju* fails to teach or suggest "determining whether a link . . . is assigned to the ID," as recited in claim 1. The Examiner argues:

[T]he claimed "link" is the referenced "location." . . . Further, even if an object is always referenced, *Lakhamraju* must make a determination when reassigning links to the migrated object to avoid trying to move links multiple times.

Advisory Action, Continuation Sheet. With respect to record 007 above, the Examiner incorrectly alleged that merely addressing record 007 in lock file 3-1 constitutes determining whether record 007 is contained in lock file 3-1. Similarly, with respect to the location, the Examiner incorrectly alleges that merely referencing the location constitutes determining whether the location is assigned to the reference. In *Lakhamraju*, the location (whether old location or new location) is always assigned to the reference. Thus, *Lakhamraju* fails to teach or suggest determining whether the location is assigned to the reference. Furthermore, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, merely referencing the location is not determining whether the location is assigned to the reference.


In view of the foregoing reasons and reasons provided in the Amendment After Final, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 5, 2009

By:   
Peter C. Yi  
Reg. No. 61,790  
202.408.4485